

REMARKS

Applicants traverse the rejections of claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-13, 15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over GROSS. Independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended to clarify that the old destination switch (old service destination in claim 8) is associated with the discontinued service. Such a feature previously existed in the preamble. However, to be absolutely clear, the language is now also recited in the body of the claim.

Applicants respectfully submit that GROSS is unrelated to forwarding calls from a number to which service has been discontinued. Rather, GROSS relates to standard call forwarding, in which the subscriber actively subscribes to both the old number and the new number.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1, 8, and 15 are allowable over the references applied in the Official Action, at least for the reasons set forth above. Applicants further submit that each of claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16-21 is allowable at least for depending, directly or indirectly, from an allowable independent claim, as well as for additional reasons related to their own recitations.

The amendments to the claims add no new matter. Moreover, entry of the amendments is believed to be proper even though this application is subject to a final rejection. Applicants submit that the amended subject matter was previously recited within the claims, as the preamble "breathes life and meaning" into the claims. Thus, it is believed that the Examiner should have previously considered such a limitation (and he may have, in fact, previously considered the limitation). Therefore, no new issues

have been raised that would require further consideration by the Examiner, and entry of the amendment is believed to be proper.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicants have discussed the features recited in Applicants' claims and have shown how these features are not taught, disclosed nor rendered obvious by the references cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the outstanding Official Action and allowance of the present application and all the claims are respectfully requested.

The above amendments have been presented merely for the purpose of clarification, and not to overcome the applied prior art. Accordingly, no estoppel is deemed to result from any of the present amendments.

Should there be any comments or questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Laura CULLI et al.

William E. Lyddane

Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

William E. Lyddane
Reg. No. 41,568

April 14, 2006
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191